

Pueblo School District No. 60

Billed Entity Number: 142321

Form 471 Application Number: 416616

Funding Request Number: 1146348

Funding Year 8



Superintendent

Ph: (719) 549-7148

Fax: (719) 549-7112



315 West 11th Street, Pueblo, Colorado 81003

October 26, 2005

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary 445-12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

RE: CC Docket No. 02-6, Request for Review

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 7 2005

FCC - MAILPOOM

This letter is submitted to the Federal Communications Commission as a Request for Review of an Administrator's Decision on Appeal- Funding Year 2004-2005 made September 21, 2005 by the Universal Service Administrative Company, Schools & Libraries Division. The initial Appeal and this Request for Review is submitted by:

PUEBLO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 60 Applicant name:

Billed Entity Number: 142321 Form 471 Application Number: 416616 Funding Request number: 1146348 Decision on Appeal: DENIED Date of Decision and Notification: 9/21/2005 Date Appeal Must Be Received By: 11/21/2005

General

Initial 471 and support documents were filed with the USAC within the time frames required and in a fashion that complies with the rules and regulations of the program. Funding request number 1146348 requesting funding for a pre-discount amount of \$1,374.986.96 was denied on 6/7/2005 by the USAC for bidding violation. Decision explanation was, "Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal."

Initial appeal of the decision was submitted on June 20, 2005 to USAC stating that the award was made to the lowest bidder and complied with the rules defined in form 470, that the bid chosen "is the most cost effective". The simplest definition of most cost effective is Low Bid. In addition, information was provided to USAC in the form of an analysis performed by an independent consultant verifying that the award was made to the lowest bidder and validating the determination originally made. Analysis attached.

USAC responded with a denial letter, copy attached, sighting that information provided by Pueblo School District 60 regarding vendor selection and evaluation criteria, "clearly showed that the price (financial response) was weighted the same as other factors (technical response and value add response) in choosing the winning bid. You failed to provide evidence that price was the dominant factor in the vendor selection process where multiple bids were received."

Our response to this point is that Pueblo School District 60 did award the contract to the lowest bid as verified by our independent review of the bid responses and does comply with USAC's

own rule of selecting the "most cost effective services offering." See attached review of all of the bids submitted and the results.

USAC continued in explaining the reason for denial that, "SLD's review of your form 471 application determined that price was not the primary factor when you selected your primary service provider. Since you did not demonstrate in your appeal that price was the primary factor when you selected your service provider, SLD denies your appeal."

Our response to this point is that the evaluation criteria submitted, established a basis for comparison of vendor responses to determine the best overall value to the District and help facilitate a buy verses lease decision. The District, like any company or institution, would weigh the financial manner in which to proceed with a project of this sort and evaluate all of the bids based on different criteria for the different approaches. The District had previously passed a 98.5 million dollar bond issue and considered ownership of the network as an option to leased services. The decision to lease these services coincided with selecting the vendor based on lowest price. The tabulated results demonstrate that lowest cost from the vendor selected was the basis for selection of leased services.

The request for proposal meets a standard for any educational institution evaluating options and the financial manner in which to proceed with a project of this sort. The reviews of the bids mandated different weighing criteria for buy verses lease decisions. The weighing factor identified by SLD in their review was to be used in the "buy" decision process. In the buy decision process, value add (which in itself is part of the price) and the technical response becomes a more important component in the decision making process.

But the District did not buy. The District leased. Consequently the District used "lowest price" to determine the award on <u>a lease</u> of the required services from a telecommunication company for service.

When leasing a telecommunications service over a longer period of time, it is understood that the telecommunications provider would be able to modify the service to meet the needs of the District during the course of the contract. Hence price was the only determining factor in making the award, as we stated in our initial appeal. During the 471 audit procedure, SLD did not ask for an in depth explanation of the reason as to why a number of non-necessary evaluations were included in the Districts re-cap forms. Such as under step three of "RFP-Record of Response," the display of "Total WAN Value" which defines an asset value to the district based on a "buy" approach.

On a lease, no value would be associated with the network. Just a total cost. Once again, the <u>District opted for a lease</u> of WAN services from a qualified telecommunications company and used lowest price for determining the award. See attached analysis.

Point three in the denial letter, copy attached, speaks to 47 C.F.R. & 54.511(a), requiring applicants to select the most cost-effective services offering "with price being the primary factor". Once again, as we demonstrated in the first two points, we in fact did use price as the only determination point in making the lease of WAN services decision. The information requested and provided during the 2004 and 2005 audits showed and listed information that was mis-construed by the SLD during their review as it dealt with buying as compared to leasing. The SLD did not understand that. Again, the District had to make a buy verses lease decision before making an award and the review and evaluation sheets were written in such a way as to provide pertinent information in support of the buy or lease decision. The buy decision used a weighted system for three different criteria and all three were weighted the

same. The lease decision was based only on price as stipulated in our award and subsequent appeal to the SDC.

Point three in the denial letter also speaks to and references the Ysleta Independent School District review and the results of review, specifically that ineligible products and services may not be factored into the cost effective evaluation. Again, the only time Pueblo School District 60 would consider ineligible products in its decision in awarding a contract, would be in a "buy" situation. Since the District determined it would be in its best interests to Lease the WAN data services, cost for the services became the only consideration in the decision.

We thank you for the time required to complete a review of the SDC's initial denial and the denial of the District's appeal. We feel that during the appeal process, direct communications between the District and the SDC's appeal reviewer would have allowed us to articulate our position and share with them the reason for the structure of our RFP documents and review sheets and could have allowed them to make the correct decision based upon the facts and information provided. We inquired as to the status of our appeal on three different occasions and each time we were not allowed to discuss any issues or concerns that the appeal reviewer may have had.

I believe that the information provided within this letter and the supporting documentation attached fully support our position and demonstrates our compliance with the rules and regulations set forth by USAC, SLD for funding eligible schools and libraries. With that, I respectfully request that the Federal Communication Commission reverse the "denial" decision reached by USAC, SLD and approve the funding requested by Pueblo County School District 60 for year 2004-2005, funding year 7.

Sincerely,

J¢yc**e**/⊦. Bales

Layre I, Bales

ifb/nf

Pueblo County District 60

Bid Analysis for lease

By: ADVODA LLC

Date: 6/15/2005

Proposal re-cap by E-Rate consultant of submitted bids/proposals.

The calculations are to determine the accuracy and validate the award to ExOp of Missouri/Unite. Information used to perform this analysis was the same set of documents provided to USAC as part of their audit which generated their decision.

	ExOp of			
	Missouri/Unite	Secom	Qwest	Comcast
Non Recurring	\$ 3,989,663.00	\$ 3,750,017.00	\$ 49,200.00	\$ 1,450,000.00
Monthly Recurring for 48 mo's	\$ 3,759.00			
Monthly Recurring for 132 mo's	\$ 15,000.00			
Monthly Recurring for 180 mo's		\$ 14,000.00	\$ 71,430.00	\$ 70,000.00
Contract term total in months	180	180	180	180
Total Term Cost	\$ 6,150,095.00	\$ 6,270,017.00	\$ 12,906,600.00	\$ 14,050,000.00

Note: The ExOp of Missouri response has two monthly prices based upon different periods. The other respondees have a single MRC for the length of the agreement.

Remarks: Secom contacted OTM after the proposal closed and advised that their price quote will likely have to increase due to cost adjustments, made by the local utility pole owner.

Lower bidder proposal based on front end costs and monthly recurring costs for the term of the agreement is ExOp of Missouri/Unite.

The actual contract award to ExOp of Missouri/Unite was \$6,015,167.00, 2.2% less than the original bid.

The value added services offered by Unite are NOT taken into consideration or part of the basis for the award.

NOTICE:

ADVODA LLC, the E-rate consultant as previously dis-closed to the audit team at USAC, did not participate in the RFP development, or vendor response review. The information generated on this document by ADVODA is an attempt to determine how the USAC audit team reached their decision.

Based on our review of the data provided USAC, we feel that the denial is in error.

Ron Dunworth ADVODA LLC



Universal Service Administrative Company

Schools & Libraries Division

Administrator's Decision on Appeal - Funding Year 2004-2005

September 21, 2005

Ron Dunworth Advoda LLC 7375 East Orchard Road, Suite 200 Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Re: Applicant Name:

PUEBLO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 60

Billed Entity Number: Form 471 Application Number: 142321 416616

Funding Request Number(s):

1146348

Your Correspondence Received: June 20, 2005

After thorough review and investigation of all relevant facts, the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) has made its decision in regard to your appeal of SLD's Funding Year 2004 Funding Commitment Decision Letter for the Application Number indicated above. This letter explains the basis of SLD's decision. The date of this letter begins the 60-day time period for appealing this decision to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). If your Letter of Appeal included more than one Application Number, please note that you will receive a separate letter for each application.

Funding Request Number(s):

1146348

Decision on Appeal:

Denied

Explanation:

- On appeal, you state that ExOp of Missouri/Unite was not only the lowest price bidder but was also one of only two who met the required specifications of the RFP. You affirm that even if the ExOp of Missouri response was not the low bid, following the USAC requirement that price is to be the primary factor in selecting a service provider, the individual evaluations performed by the evaluation committee would indicate that ExOp of Missouri/Unite would have still won the award. In closing, you request that the letter of appeal be reviewed.
- After thorough review of the appeal, the relevant facts, and documentation, it was determined that the SLD's decision to deny the application was correct. During the Selective Review of your application, you provided a response on November 11, 2004 regarding vendor selection and evaluation criteria. That response clearly

showed that the price (Financial Response) was weighted the same as other factors (Technical Response and Value Add Response) in choosing the winning bid. You failed to provide evidence that price was the dominant factor in the vendor selection process where multiple bids were received.

- SLD's review of your Form 471 application determined that price was not the
 primary factor when you selected your service provider. Since you did not
 demonstrate in your appeal that price was the primary factor when you selected
 your service provider, SLD denies your appeal.
- FCC rules require that applicants select the most cost-effective services offering with price being the primary factor. 47 C.F.R. § 54.511(a). Applicants may take other factors into consideration, but in selecting the winning bid, price must be given more weight than any other single factor. 47 C.F.R. § 54.511(a); Request for Review by Ysleta Independent School District, et. al., Federal State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, Order, FCC 03-313 ¶ 50 (rel. Dec. 8, 2003). Ineligible products and services may not be factored into the cost-effective evaluation. See Common Carrier Bureau Reiterates Services Eligible for Discounts to Schools and Libraries, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, 13 FCC Rcd. 16,570, DA 98-1110 (rel. Jun. 11, 1998).

If your appeal has been approved, but funding has been reduced or denied, you may appeal these decisions to either the SLD or the FCC. For appeals that have been denied in full, partially approved, dismissed, or canceled, you may file an appeal with the FCC. You should refer to CC Docket No. 02-6 on the first page of your appeal to the FCC. Your appeal must be received or postmarked within 60 days of the date on this letter. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic dismissal of your appeal. If you are submitting your appeal via United States Postal Service, send to: FCC, Office of the Secretary, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. Further information and options for filing an appeal directly with the FCC can be found in the "Appeals Procedure" posted in the Reference Area of the SLD web site or by contacting the Client Service Bureau. We strongly recommend that you use the electronic filing options.

We thank you for your continued support, patience and cooperation during the appeal process.

Schools and Libraries Division
Universal Service Administrative Company

School District No. 60 11 11 11



Wide Area Telecommunications Services Project

Recommendation

Prepared for: Board of Trustees January 27, 2004

Submitted By: OTM Engineering, Inc

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Recommendation	5
Appendix	6
RFP-Record of Response	6
Technology Committee Evaluation Matrix	7
OTM Freshantion Moterix	

Executive Summary

After assessing the current status of the districts technology systems, it was apparent that any means of augmenting the budgeted technology bond funds would be in the district's best interest. OTM began exploring the various outside funding sources available to the district. After discussing the possibility of qualifying for funding through Erate, the district decided to engage OTM to begin the process of locating a vendor qualified and capable of leasing Wide Area Network services to PSD60. It was agreed that a formal Request for Proposal (RFP) process would be used to find the correct vendor sufficient to enable an Erate application prior to February 1, 2004. The results of the process and subsequent recommendation follow.

Four telecommunications service providers responded to the districts request for proposal made public on December 5, 2003. The RFP was designed to identify a company that could lease a fiber optic wide area network to the District for a minimum of fifteen years. Vendors were also asked to propose any alternate solutions that would be of value to the District relative to internet access, a separate voice network, and a separate video network. The proposal documents also stipulated the requirement that both commercial and other public entities have access to the network.

Two of the four vendors met all requirements. Qwest provided a solution that did not meet the bandwidth requirements of the RFP. Both Qwest and Comcast did not include the 5% RFP response bond clearly required in the proposal documents, nor offered a solution for the minimum required fifteen year term. Secom met all of the technical requirements of the RFP, however, presented a cashiers check in lieu of the required surety issued 5% response bond. Secom contacted OTM after the proposal submission date and indicated their price quote was likely to increase due to cost adjustments made by the local utility pole owner. Unite met all requirements as stated in the proposal documents.

When the proposals were received, an extensive evaluation process was initiated. OTM compiled all vendor response data into spreadsheet form and presented the data to the technology

committee during a closed door session on January 13. The proposals were discussed in detail and clarification items identified. OTM sought clarifications from the vendors. OTM then developed a weighted evaluation matrix for use by the technology committee on January 16. The committee agreed on the weighting values for each of the evaluation criteria items. Each member of the committee completed and submitted an evaluation of all four companies to OTM. OTM completed the same evaluation. The results are illustrated in the appendix. The evaluation information and feedback from the committee enables OTM to offer its recommendations for the vendor that provides the most valuable solution to the District.

Recommendation

After careful consideration of all proposals, it is OTM Engineering's recommendation that the school district enter into a lease agreement with Unite. They clearly have met all of the RFP criteria and the scrutiny of the PSD60 Technology committee. By entering into this form of agreement the district will have the opportunity to apply for supplemental federal funding that will certainly enable the current technology bond funds to exceed what was originally forecasted and expected by the district. In addition, Unite has offered to include six additional fiber strands to each school at no additional cost. The fiber may be used for future applications such as Fiber Channel connectivity for a Storage Area Network, integration of a separate building automation system or even a separate A/V broadcast network.

This additional capacity plus the high bandwidth voice and data network will meet the demands of the district today and well into the future. Bandwidth will no longer be an issue and instructional and administrative applications can be supported. Network costs will be known and the possible benefit to the community a reality.

Below are the cost options available to the district based on a payout over fifteen or three years with the assumption Erate will fund the project at the same rate they have funded the WAN network currently in use by the district. The difference between the two scenarios from the cost perspective is \$43,644.00.

Fillion Year		60 months	120 months	Sub Total	Erate Funded	Dist Cost	
Non Recurring	3,989,663			3,969,653	2,673,068	1,316,585	
Recurring Years 1-5	3,759	225,540		225,540	151,112	101,245	
Recurring Years 6-15	15,000		1,800,000	1,800,000	1,206,000	808,020	
Value Add (6 Strand Fiber)	1,000,000			1,000,000		(1,000,000)	1
Total Value of Network						1,225,850	
TOTAL Cost To District				7,015,193	4,030,179	2,225,850	•
Three Year -4.8% NPV Discount		60 months	120 months	Sub Total	Erate Funded	Diet Coet	4.8% NPV Dis
Three Year -4.8% NPV Discount	3,989,553	60 months	120 months	Sub Total 3,989,653	Erate Funded 2,873,068	Diet Coet 1,316,585	4.8% NPV Dis. 1,318,585
Three Year -4.8% NPV Discount Non Recurring	3,989,653 3,759	60 months 225,540	120 months				
Three Year -4.8% NPV Discount Non Recurring Recurring Years 1-5			120 months	3,989,653	2,573,068	1,316,585	1,318,585
Three Year 4.8% NPV Discount Non Recurring Recurring Years 1-5 Recurring Years 6-15	3,759			3,989,653 225,540	2,873,068 161,112	1,316,585 101,246	1,318,585 96,385
Scensife #2 Three Year -4.8% NPV Discount Non Recurring Recurring Years 1-5 Recurring Years 6-15 Value Add (6 Strand Fiber) Total Value of Network	3,759 15,000			3,989,653 225,540 1,800,000	2,873,068 161,112	1,316,585 101,246	1,318,585 96,385 769,235

Appendix

RFP-Record of Response

Vender	Quest	U-JUJ	Cocont	Cheneke
5% Response Sand Submitted			Yes-Cashlers Chack	
Signature page signed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yee
Response in format requested	Yes	Y 46	Yes	Yes
Submitted on time	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

p 2 Submitter Compliance

	12.02	17.1	1			
L. UNA		LINE .		Secon .	Q1, 22 2	Comcest
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yee
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yee	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes 1	Yes	Yes
Yee	Yes	Yes	¥	Yee	Yee	Yee
Yes	Yes	Yee	Yes	Yee	Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yea	Yes	Yee	Y96	Yes
One	One	One	TWO	Two		Minor
yes	yes	yes	Y	Yes	Yes	y46
Yes	Yee	Yee	¥¥	Yes		Yes Yes
Y46	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
	Yes	Yes Yes One One Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Cres One One Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes One One Two Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes One One One Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

		سنخشر شدنت	
MED 7	Andread Property lies	ويبالشاب	

Stair 3 Pinerides Bushiplians							
Vendor	Unite-Socialità 1	Charles Married &	THE BOOK T	Speed	Second .	Quego	Comeas
B240	Redundent	Core Redundant	Redundant and Diverse	Sonet	Elhemet	100Mb	Ethernet
Non Recurring	\$2,660,000	\$2,500,000	\$3,960,663	\$6,360,017	\$3,750,179	\$49,200	\$1,450,000
Recurring	3,431.00	3,760.00	3,769.00	\$14,000	\$14,000	871,430	\$70,000
Discount	4.80	4.80	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10.00	10.00	0	0
Alt 1-voice network	No Bid	No Bid	No Bld		No Bid		No Bid
Non Recurring	No Bid	No Bld	No Bid	0.00	No Bid	0	No Bid
Recurring	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	\$4,000	No Bid	\$4,978	No Bid
Discount	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	10.00	No Bid	•	No Bid
Alt 2-Video						<u> </u>	
Non Recurring	\$202,600	\$202,500	\$202,600	No fild	No Bld	\$43,200	No Bid
Recurring	\$2,360	\$2,360	\$2,350	No Bid	No Bid	\$62,640	No Bld
Discount	4,80	4.80	4.60	No Bid	No Bid	•	No 6ld
Alt 3-Internet Access	SMb	26/6	91/16	38/6	3Mb	45Mbps	No Bid
Non Recurring	\$63,418	\$63,418	\$63,418	0	Ö	6	No Bid
Recurring	\$1,321	\$1,321	\$1,321	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$10,557	No Bid
Discount	4.0	4.8	4.8	0	0	0	No B4d
Value Add Offering							†
Derk Fiber	\$780,500	\$956,500	\$1,050,750			1	
Monitoring Solivers				\$5,700	\$5,700		t
Total WAN Value	\$3,610,600	\$4,458,500	\$5,049,403	\$6,366,717	\$3,755,879	\$49,200	\$1,450,000

Technology Committee Evaluation Matrix

RFP Grading totals

Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Baulo RFP Response	3	53	159
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format		ļ. ———	
Due Date Met			!
15 Year Term Offered	2	43	- 86
Fine nois! Response	3	46	138
Technical Response	- 3	- 44	138
Value Add Response		46	138
Past Experience with District		31	31
Me Intene nos/Be rvice		3,	74
Staff-Technical and Admir		3	72
Proximity to Distric		4	41
Total	4	<u> </u>	877

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Beale RFP Response	3	33	99
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form		L	
REP in required format			
Due Date Met		ļ	
15 Year Term Offered	2	43	86
Pinenciel Response	3	21	63
Technical Response	3	32	105
Value Add Response	3		63
Past Experience with District		31	31
Me intens nce/Service		31	62
Staff-Technical and Admir	-	2 41	80
Proximity to Distric		21	20
Total	 		620

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Baule RFP Response	3	26	76
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
REP in required formet		L	
Due Cate Met		<u> </u>	
15 Year Term Offered	- 2	5	10
Finencial Response	3	2	64
Technical Response	3	25	8.
Value Add Response			2
Past Experience with Distric		16	11
Maintenance/Service		37	7
Staff-Technical and Admir		37	7
Proximity to Distric		3.	3
Total	d		46

Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic AFP Response	3		
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required formet			
Due Date Met			
18 Year Term Offered	2	33	66
Finencial Response	3	18	54
Technical Response	3	21	63
Value Add Response	3	3	
Past Experience with District			4
Me intens noe/Service	- 3	17	34
Staff-Technical and Admin		26	58
Proximity to District		27	27
Total			372

Weighting Scale	Point Awarded 1-10
1- Important	1- Non Responsive
2- Very Important	2-
3- Extremely Important	3-
	4
	5-
	6-
	7-
	8-
	9-
	10-Superior Response

OTM Evaluation Matrix

Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total	ľ
Basic RFP Response	3			60
Bid Bond			L	
Signature on Proposal Form				
RFP in required formet			L	
Due Date Met		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
15 Year Term Offered	2	20		40
Financiai Response	3	18		54
Technical Response	3	17		51
Value Add Response	3	3 20		60
Past Experience with District		1 1	二	11
Maintenance/Service		2		10
Staff-Technical and Admis	1	2	В	10
Proximity to Distric	4	1 1	•	10
Tota	1		1	310

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total	ı
Besic RFP Response	3	12		36
Bid Bond				
Signature on Proposal Form				_
RFP in required format				_
Due Date Met				-
15 Year Term Offered	2	2		4
Financial Response	3	16		46
Technical Response	3	18		54
Value Add Response	3	8		24
Past Experience with District				8
Maintenance/Service		2 13		26
Staff-Technical and Admin		14		28
Proximity to Distric		20		20
Tata				248

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3		
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	20	44
Financial Response	3		4
Technical Response		16	4
Value Add Response		3	2
Past Experience with District			-
Maintenance/Service		2 1:	3 2
Staff-Technical and Admir		2 1	3
Proximity to Distric		1 1	1
Tota	,		26

Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total	
Basic RFP Response	3			27
Bid Bond				
Signature on Proposal Form				
RFP in required formet				_
Due Date Met	_	ļ. ———	<u> </u>	4
15 Year Term Offered	2	3		6
Financial Response	3	12		36
Technical Response	3	3		9
Value Add Response	3	3		9
Past Experience with District	1	6		6
Maintenance/Service	2	2 10		20
Staff-Technical and Admin		2 14		28
Proximity to Distric		17	‡=	17
Tota			1 1	58

Evaluation Tabulation

•

BANCE

					JAJOT				INJOT .
1		<u></u>	07		Proximity to District	72	9)		Proximity to District
									
⊢ · →	_ ·	02			Staff-Technical and Admin	72	- 01	7	Staff-Technical and Admin
					cimba has lestedas T. Beta	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Almba has included Amile
I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	57	2	2	Maintenence/Service	3.0	οi	€.	Maintenance/Service
				_					
			7		Past Experience with District	67	- 67		Poet Experience with District
	·		——————————————————————————————————————					_	3,000
l								_	00100001 201000
1	<u>1</u>	<u></u>		Z	sanogesA bbA sulsV				eenogaan bbA suleV
1							_		
1			- 07	7	eanogee# lapindoeT	66	-	3	Technical Response
· · · · · · · · · ·									
L					Financial Response		8	_	Financial Response
<u>-</u>					Aggrange Pologogia				and interest
		0.7	0/	て	Denetto error teat &f	- 2		Ų	benefitti met teet er
<u></u>		·			Doe Date Mot	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Oue Date Met
		- · ·							
10-Superior Response		. 1	l		harmot beniupen ni 약략위				Serrici beniupes ni 9759
-6					mod lesopory no entriengic				Signature on Proposal Form
		- · - 			Bid Bond				Bid Bond
		- 	8			172		_	sanoqaafi 449 dasa
-/_		1.3			senogas/ii 94/ii olasfi		44		
-9		Total	Point Award	OutrigieVV	Gwest	iateT	brawA Into9	CrititicieW	JasomoD .
-5			i		L				
		1	!		_ i				
	3- Extremely important				lato1				lego?
<u> </u>		- 						1	
5.	2-Very Important				Annual or Amiron II	77	9/	-	201 0000 00 000000
1- Non Responsive	instructrii - l	62	0/		Proximity to District			<u> </u>	Proximity to District
OF-F DebuswA trioci	Waighting Scale				1	- l			·
07.1 00	-15	65	4/	-7	Staff-Technical and Admin	102	0/	7	Staff-Technical and Admin
L					despite took to 2 miles				-1-24 - 1-1-1-1-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2-2
l							D /		
		3.5	47		esivieSleanendalald	42		•	ecivie8\ecramenteli
								i	
		7/	0/		Past Experience with District	77	07	*	Past Experience with District
									
	<u></u>					30	0/		naved and a second
	i	51	5	-	senogesh bbA sulsV		/	-	sanogas/i bbA suis/
	 		T	€	nanogas/i kalindas/	3.6	4/	E.	Senogesh isolation
i									· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
L			27			30	- 07		Financial Response
l <u></u>		- 61			eanogest leisnerFi				control Information
l ::=:==			!						
			97	7	benefitô mat ney at	97	9/		Davello miet seek &t
·	— ·· ·· ··- 								
			 		Due Dele Met				Due Date Met
		. 			Isomol benupen ni 9757			1	termot benupen ni 97.19
1 _ 1		 _	L						HINCH CONTROL LINE CONTROL
			l		mon lesogoid no suitengi?		<u> </u>		moil lesogorif no stutengic
<u>r</u>					Bid Bond				Bid Bond
		81	- 0)	2	Benggest 41A slead	30	9/	E	eanoges/i 41/i olas@
} 		16301	Point Award	Bullygiew			DIEWA INION	CURUDIONA	etinU
1		1 15001							
1	i i	''-							-41-11

	Ī			r	Second.	Weighting	Point Award	1	1		
	Supple Supple	티	8	1	100000	3		7	+		
Basic 1079 Response	3	9	27	Ī	10000			\ '\			
Old Brood)			2	CON DOT						
					COMPANY ON PROPOSE FORTH						
				_	IFP in required torner						
FP in regulated sample					Se Date Met		k				
Due Date Met	Ī					2		1			
	•	K	ļ		15 Year Torns Offered				1		
15 Year Term Offered	1	1							1	C LOW TOTAL	
		ķ	•		Financial Responde	*	1		3	The same	
Financial Response	p-	2	1	T					1	\	
					Total Bearing	3	Q	S S	1		
Technical Response	7	d									
					A	-	7	•			
Value Add Response	7	1	3.5		VARIA PAR INCIDENT	Ļ		 - -			
	_				210		2	5			
Seat Seathern with Desired	_	5	5		Page Experience with Learning						
						ķ	,	ė			
	1	4	Ş		Majaritation Co. Service		1				
	1						 	ç			
	L		ķ		Staff-Technical and Admin		=			San Printers	Point Asserded 1-10
Staff-Technical Bittl Auren	1	1									11- Nan Responsive
			ľ		District to District	-	S	5		Walter I	ç
Productive to District	`	2	70		The state of the s					2- Very Importan	
						1		da		3. Extremely importent	-
	4		50		1001	2					+
	L										4
			_		1	National Section 1	Point Amend	Į			
Comcast	X CONTRACTOR	Weighting Point Award	d Total			+		7			ż
Park Rep Reserves	-	/	3		Basic New Integration	+					*
			-		Bit Bond						4
					Signature on Proposal Form						10-Superior Response
Signature on Proposal Form					REP in mouthed format						
27-P in required former			\ +		2-1-2-14m						
Date Date Met			1		DOD THE WAY						
						,	9	20			
15 Year Term Offered	7		,		TO THE LEWIS COLUMN						
	L				Section 1	\ \ \ \ \	~	15			
Plannia Response	. 3	,	4]_					
		\ 	\ \ \		********	*	`	3			
Tachnical Response		4	4		1 cm mari						
					A 4.4 Comments	,	-	~			
Value And Reserves	2	1	7		VIEW AND INC.	ļ	-	•			
	L	L					 -				
Past Franchece with District	*	,	7		Past Experience with Literal				'		
						,	15	0/			
Methodocochick	70 8	9	2								
	Ц		ľ		Section Technical and Marie	2	٨	ai			
Staff-Technical and Admin	4	d	2	\downarrow		Į.					
		\ 	: -	-	Proximity to District	,		4	-		
Presidently to District		1	1	-			·	ļ	\downarrow		
	-		2	-	Te	199		1	1		

January 16,2004 Ronda Literilar)

Unite	Weighting	Point Assert	1010		Secorn	Weighting	Port Americ	3		
	•		Ş		Back RFP Response	_	4	יַל		
Seeks MFP Mesponee	1	2	8	1	Bld Board					
Bid Bond					Only Day					
meters on Proposal Form										
P in required formal					ALL IN TRACTION COMME					
Due Dete Mer				-	Out Date Met					
				1		•		٩		
15 Year Term Offered	7	8	*		15 Year Lerin Chieses	1				
	-	,	Ş		Fhancial Response			\$		
Technical Responde	M	à	Q		Technical Response	4	7	1		
				1		1	ļ		-	
Value Add Response	4	0	8	1	Value Add Response	1	1			
		K		†	Part Property with District	-	4	•		
Post Experience with District	1	1	1				1 1			
Meintenence/Bervice	4	9	1,8		Maintenance/Service	2	9	9		
				1					+	
Staff-Technical and Admin	7	6	8		Staff-Technical and Admin	1	g	+	Medicifing Scale	Point Asserted 1-10
				1					1- Important	1- Non Responsive
Proximity to District	1	07	0		Precimity to District		2	1	7. Mary Secretary	2
									A C. Very Head Land	7
Total			621		Total			3	THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN	т
Comcest	Weighting	Point Award	Total		Owest	Weighting	Point Award	Total		
Charle 1977 Recuests	_		*		Besic RFP Response	2	 	2		-
Pld Bond	┺			!	Bid Bond	Ľ				
County on Proceed Form					Standure on Proposal Form					ż
RFP in neurined format					RFP in required formet					10-Superior Response
2.5					Due Date Met	_				-
Care me.										
At Very Term Officer	,	-			15 Year Term Offered	7	-	4		-
	1						Ц			
Financial Response	6	,,			Financial Response		2	•		
	Ц					1	ļ			\ \ \ \
Technical Resense	ç	4	- 2		Technical Mesponse	4	1	1		
	\downarrow	ļ	ľ		Section Code Section		-			
VINUE AND THE BORNE	4	1	•		Name of the Party					
Past Ernariance with District	-	ļ			Past Experience with District	١	-			
Maintenance/Service	4	2	01		Maintenance/Service	2	4	7		
	┙					-	,	2		
Staff-Technical and Admin	1	4	9			4				
Presidenty to District	-	8	~		Proximity to District	-	5	9		
				L		5				

Mours 81-16 04

toor - 21-1

			(1)					$\langle a \rangle$				
			\wedge		70	lajo]	Г Т	96)		02	Total	i
												ĺ
						Proximity to District	├				Proximally to District	l
			 - -	L	r	Staff-Technical and Admin		左	_ <u>L</u>	7	Start-Technical and Admin	
			- <u>j.</u>	1	2	estveliaseneneinisti	 	r	v	7	esivvetiesaansimilii	
			0	V		Papi Experience with Diebict		7			Past Experience with Chaintet	İ
								<u> </u>		-		İ
			0	0		earequest bbA euleV		<u>6</u>	•	<u> </u>	sanogeoff bbA suleY	l
			<u> </u>			senegeef lealnrine)		5	5	- 5	Technical Response	1
			\$	1		Financial Response		2		E	Firmicial Response	1
			٦_		7	benefit) mneT neeY &!		7		2	benefit met teet है!	Ì
						Date Met	 -				New Date Met	1
10-Superior Response						James of Parish in 1995					termol beniupen of 4759	l
-5						mio-i leactors no antiengle					mo? issogor? no entiengi?	ł
-0						Pid Bond					Bid Bond	i
			0			senoquafi q-bf slead	l	2		2	eanoges) Till stasi	
			InjoT	brewA Intoff	polyticleVV)sewD		PEP 01	brand Into-	ontinoie VV.	Comcast	l
Š								_				i
*							┼i ≠			94		i
	3- Extremely Important		(2h)		96	lajo!	 	15)		174	leto T	ĺ
5-						Programmy to District	 				Proximity to District	1
Dt-t betnewok inio9 evienoges/i not/-t	Weighting Scale 1- Impertant		<u>'</u> —	· · · · ·			 	-				Ι.
OP-1 belrand total			11	1		nimbA bras lassimise T-Naxe		4	ル	2	almbA bns lesiniseT-heiß	1
			17	7	7	sulvie@/sugmetrie		7	7	1	solviečisonsaelidiski	1
						Pest Experience with District		1			Past Experience with District	1
								_				1
			9	- \	- 6	eanogee/i bbA euteV	 	D.	y		senogeeff bbA evisy	2
			9	<u> </u>		nanogasii laolintosT		,	- 4	- 3 .	Technical Response	۲
			9	7.		eanogaeA laionani1		5	_ ኒ	₹.	Penogesfi Rianshi1	(
		-	<u> </u>	7	7	brund mark and the		ł.	7	Z	benefic) seet the Y &f	
						100 min min min min min min min min min min	 				Oue Date Met	İ
		L				Remot being in 1986 Self eten Met					Isomoj berlupen ni 949	l
						mod lesogord no entrengio	 				mod lesogord no mulengis	
	 	 	 			brod big					broß biß	ı
			9	-1	-	eanogesh 117 steel	 	qı	_ ~	Y	ennoques Fill aless	ı
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Total	Point Award	QuintgleW	20cow	1 I	(EDC)	Daint Amic9		-Unite	i

-		ĺ			ŀ			۱			
	I		Point Asses	Total	-	Secom	Weighting	Point Award			.1
`	Besic NFP Response	9			1	Basic NFP Response	3			-	
_			ר		7	Bid Bond		^			
7 9	Signature on Proposed Form		زو		7	Signature on Proposal Form		1.6			,
`	RFP in required formet		دنه	-	1	FGFP in required format		1 (10		!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	:
_	Due Date Met				Š	Due Dete Met				1	<u>:</u>
•					Ц						
	15 Year Torm Offered	7	~			15 Year Term Offered	7	7	†	-	
					+			•	1		
	Pinencial Response	7			+	Financial Response	ĸ	2		-	
	Total Bearing	K	K		+	Tachair Sements	K			: : :	-
		1	1		ŀ						:
	Value Add Response	3	4		Н	Value Add Response	5	,			
					-					1	
	Part Experience with District	1			2	est Experience with District	_				i .
		•	_	1	+	W. Landerson		8	+		•
		*	1		1		1	8			
	Staff-Technical and Admin	k	7	-	F	teff-Technical and Admin	7	,			
	_				H					Waighting Scale	Point Awarded 1-10
	Proximity to Obstrict	_	_		L	Proximity to Dietrics				1- Important	1-Non Responsive
										2- Very Important	2-
	Total	90	7.1			Total	30	7.5		3- Extremely importent	3-
_					H						
					Н						-5
	Comcast	Weighting		Total		Qwest	Welching	Point Amend	Total		-6
7	Basic 1819 Response	3	3		Ļ	Deals RFF Response	Ę.				7
~	П		c		P	kd Bond		4			4
-	Signeflue on Proposal Form		4		7	Signature on Proposed Form			+		A Change of the Contract of th
-	Id-P in required format		78	2	7	FG-P in required homes		7	1		10-Superior Page Control
_	Due Date Met		7		<u>.</u>	Das Ogra Med.		71		: +	:
>	15 Year Term Offered	n	٥		<u> </u>	15 Year Term Offered	~	2			
	₩.										
	Financial Response	4	4		4	Financial Response	5		+	-	-
	Technical Personal	K	0	<u> </u>	+	Technical Response	e	G			
					L						
	Value Add Response	ę	٩		Ц	Value Add Response	E	q			:
						A 19 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40		(1		
	Past Experience with District		$\left\{ \right.$		1	AN Experience was created			 - 		
	Maintenance/Barvice	2	7		\coprod	Mahrtemansferder	2	d			
	Staff-Technical and Admin	स्र	7	+	=	toff-Technical and Admin	Ç	3			
	Proximity to District				H	Proximity to District	-	-			-
							,	4			
_	Total	95	2	_	+		20	9			

Bunda Liagh

"/ ST

		X2	2			ledoT	501	9			(4)OT
			\perp								
	·	l	5			Proximity to District		- 5			Proximity to District
		<u> </u>						. 78.1		- 13	
!				- 8	<u> </u>	Staff-Technical and Admin		91	—	T	nimbA and haintaoT-Nate
است برين		├╴ ╶ ─ ─						7) 🗲	X 5	-	Maintenence/Service
		 2	<u>_</u>	<u> </u>		solvre@eoneneiseld		7/ -	0.9		
i		 				Past Experience with District		0	0		Past Experience with District
										—— <u>'</u>	
		-				venogeest bbA evicy		_		5	senoges# bbA exist
		- - - 6									
		 -	/ 			Technical Response		7.0	9		Technical Response
	, 		`								
	· · · — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>	2	Feancies Response		-13	79		semodacy lelacenia
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		 //	-								
		81		50	7	benefity most teey of					15 Year Tenn Offered
				I	·	JalA als() ev()					19M etec au
esnogees noneque-01						Harmot benjupen ni 9759					farmol benjupes ni 950
-6						mo? leacqor? no entrangië					moi lesopord no enusargi
-9						Bid Bond					puog pi
-2					2	senogasA 419 class		7 6	5	Σ	eenogeeA 44A stead
-			Hedo T	Point Award	- Snitrigia VV	JaewD		latio?	braws Into9	gnintgleVV	Comcast
			-								
		h			··						
	3- Extramely Important	77	// -			leioT		7.61			TO(P)
	Anery Important										
evienogaes novi - I	1- important			7		Presimity to Dietrict		. 6	Ь	_	Proximity to District
OI-1 bedrawn intog	Weighting Scale										·
VI I I			7	Ь		Staff-Technical and Admin		77	8_	7	Staff-Technical and Admin
			$\overline{}$								
		79	7	2	ζ.	Maintenanceigenice		81	6	Ţ	Maintenance/Service
								6	J. J.	11	Past Experience with District
			<u> </u>			Past Experience with District					
				- 6							
			6	E		senegated bhy sukty (ottest) divisional back	•	Ø E	01		senogeeA bitA euleV
				E		seneges/i bbA euls/	•	98		6	senoges# bitA euleV
			6	<i>E b</i>			•		Ø1	6	·
			6	<i>E b</i>		etmoges/i isolades/	•	<i>ο</i> ε	01	&&	eenogeest lestentseT eenogeest back euteV
			6	<i>E B S</i>		seneges/i bbA euls/	•	98		&&	servoges# bitA euleV
		, <u>, ,</u>	6	<i>E B S O</i> 1		Financial Response		<i>ο</i> ε	01		eenogeefi laiananiii eenogeefi laianiaeT eenogeefi laik eulaV
			6	-		etmoges/i isolades/		<i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ	01 01		eenogeest lestentseT eenogeest back euteV
		, <u>, ,</u>	6	-		berefild mat ver tr emerged listenit especies listenite especies listenites value Add hespecies		<i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ	01 01		The Year Term Offered formands for a formands formands for a formand for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a formands for a forman
		, <u>, ,</u>	6	-		15 Year in required format Fine Date Meri 15 Year Tan Offerse Fine Carlotted Response Value Add Response		<i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ	01 01		in required forms! As Year Term Offered To Therefol Response Technical Response Technical Response
		, <u>, ,</u>	6	-		Surake on Proposal Form First in required forms! Out Date Met 15 Year Term Offered Financial Response Financial Response		<i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ <i>Ο</i> Σ	01 01		mother on Proposal formation of Proposal of Prince Met Gulf Dark Met Town Offered It Year Term Offered Proposal Incorporation of Incorporation of Incorpora
		L	6 C	-		But Bond Technique on Proposal Form Technique on Proposal Form Technical Response Financial Response Financial Response		0Σ 0Σ 0Σ	01 01 01		id Bond Mankus on Proposei From 1477 Date Met 16 Yest Term Offered Financial Response Financial Response Technical Response
		, h	6 C	<i>b</i>		Bacic MyP Response Bid Bond Signature on Proposal Form Ritter in required former Due Date Mei Thencial Response Trancial Response Trancial Response		0Σ 0Σ 0Σ 0τ	01 01 01	M 14 14	Pariogent Tata Jean Dood bit mod Jeacopy no exulangia farmol bringer of 479 for the force of the force of the benefic mod task at encogent laborated
5/4-		, h	6 C	5		But Bond Technique on Proposal Form Technique on Proposal Form Technical Response Financial Response Financial Response		0Σ 0Σ 0Σ 0τ	01 01 01	M 14 14	id Bond Ignatuse on Proposest ignatuse on required formest but Date Met The Technical Response Technical Response

Pate Mo-torg

2//1

			STE			le3oT	691			latoT
			72	72	l .	Proximity to District	35	32	1	tohistic of Ministerial
				0				0		
			99		7	nimbA bna lepindoeT-fisis	Þ.L	ΥE	2	aimbA bas isoladoeT-flate
			-	0	į.			0	_	
		l	HE	21	7	Maintenance/Service	74	76	2	Maintenance/Service
			-	0		Past Experience with District	81	0	+	THE PARTY LINES STATE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY
			-	0	<u> </u>	A-MANUT AND ADDRESS (1900)	181	0	 	Past Experience with District
			6	6	ε	eanogeest bbA euleV	12	 	E	senogees bbA subsV
			<u> </u>	0				- lö	 *	The said back
			E9		ε	Technical Response	40	6Z	ε	Technical Response
	- -			ó	 			0	 	
			24	81	ε	Financial Response	69	523	Ē	Financial Response
			 	0				0		
			99	88	Z	bevetto mnet teek &t	OL	S	2	benefitO mineT neeY &!
	<u> </u>		 	0				Ō		
				0		Due Date Met	·	0		John elect ou
10-Superior Response		· · · ·	1	0		Astronol benjupen ni 938		o	1	Jermoi beriupen ni 9-
-6				0		Signature on Proposal Form		0		gradure on Proposal Form
-9				0		Brid Bond		o	- "	puog p
			19	61	ε	eanoqeeR 419 plea8	72	SZ	ε	eanogeast TER pleast
			Total		DribriQieVV	CWest		T buswa mio	DUDLICHEAN	
							 		1	,,,,,,,,,,
-9'			ļ					 		
-1				1						
	Signaturi (manager -		070			(TC)	110	 		HTG.
-€			e20			IAICT	77.8			[6.90]
3- 5-	2- Very Important			67						
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		0Z9 6Z	62	l.	Solution of Vienticord Solution of Vienticord Solution of Vienticord	1/9	it.		Proximally to District lateT
3- 5-	2- Very Important		62	0	i	Proximity to District	l b	0	l.	Proximity to District
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t			0	2			0 90		
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		62 79	0		Staff-Technical and Admin Proximity to District	57	0 96 0	1	Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		62	0 i+ 0	ا د د	Proximity to District	l b	0 96 0	l.	Proximally to District
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		28 29	0 iv 0 ie 0		Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin	57	0 96 0	1	Meintenence/Service Staff-Technical and Admin Proximity to District
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		62 79	0 14 0 16 0		Staff-Technical and Admin Proximity to District	57	0 90 0 20 0	1	Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		29 29	0 i † 0 i E 0 i E		Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin Patrict Patrict	57	0 96 0 26 0 16	1	Past Experience with District Melintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		28 29	0 i † 0 i E 0 i E 0 i E	5	Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin	10 21 14	0 90 0 20 0	2	Meintenence/Service Staff-Technical and Admin Provincy to District
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		82 29 29 1E	0 i † 0 i E 0 i E	5	Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin Patrict Patrict	10 21 14	0 96 0 46 0 16 0	2	Value Add Response Past Experience with District Meintenence/Service Meintenence/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		29 29	0 149 0 16 0 16 0 12 0 12 0 56 0	5	Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin Province	1c pc)	0 96 0 26 0 16 0 99 0	2 Z	Yeshnical Response Value Add Response Past Expenience with District Maintenence/Service Maintenence/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		82 29 29 1E	0 U U U U U U U U U	5	Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin Province	1c pc)	0 90 0 12 0 15 0 90 0 90 0	2 Z	Value Add Response Past Experience with District Meintence/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		29 29 29 29 29	0 i v 0 0 1 E 0 0 1 Z 0 0 0 1 Z 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5	Financial Response Technical Response Value Add Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenance Service Staff-Technical and Admin	961 961 10	0 90 0 20 0 10 10 0 90 0 90 0 90 0	2 2 2 4	Pirancial Response Yesterical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience With District District Commission of Commission Commissi
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		29 29 29 29 29	0 119 0 110 0 110 0 127 0 127 0 128 0 127 0 128 0 128 0 128 0 128 0 128 0 128 0 128 0 0 128 0 0 128 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5	Value Add Responses Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Add Technical and Admin	961 961 15	0 98 0 28 0 18 0 18 0 99 0 99 0	2 2 1 1	Yeshnical Response Value Add Response Past Expenience with District Maintenence/Service Maintenence/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		8Z Z9 Z9 1E E9 901	0 I V O O O O O O O O O	2	The Year Term Offered Financial Responses Technical Responses Value Add Responses Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin	961 961 10	0 98 0 25 0 15 0 99 0 99 0 99 0 99 0	2 2 2 4	15 Year Term Offered Financial Response Value Add Response Methre Add Response Methre Add Response Methre Add Response Methre Add Response Methre Add Response
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		8Z Z9 Z9 1E E9 901	0 Ly O C C C C C C C C C	2	Due Date Met 15 Year Term Offered Financial Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenence/Service Steff-Technical and Admin	961 961 10	0 90 0 25 0 15 0 90 90 90 90 90 0 0	2 2 2 4	Ta Year Term Offered Financial Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		8Z Z9 Z9 1E E9 901	0 12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2	Due Dete Met The Dete Met The Dete Met Thrancial Response Technical Response Technical Response Value Add Response Value Add Response Maintenance With District Maintenance With District Maintenance Service Staff-Technical and Admin	961 961 10	0 90 0 22 0 10 10 0 90 0 90 0 90 0 90 0	2 2 2 4	Phin equinad format us Dais Most Technical Response Technical Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Maintenance/Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	inshooms t		8Z Z9 Z9 1E E9 901	0 i i i i i i i i i	2	Figure Control on Frogoses Forms Figure Control of Figure Contro	961 961 10	0 98 0 12 0 15 0 99 0 99 0 99 0 0 50 0 0	2 2 2 4	Ometing on Proposal Form FP his required format up their form Offered To Year Term Offered Technical Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District International Staff Staff-Technical and Admin
1- Non Responsive -S 	i- Important 2- Very Improdunt		8Z Z9 Z9 LE E9 G01 C9	0 I V O O O O O O O O O	2	Bid Bond Appeal Form RFP in required formal Due Date Met Than Team Offered Than Team Offered Financial Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Staff-Technical and Admin	88 861 861 861	0 98 0 12 0 15 0 99 0 99 0 0 89 0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 4	d Bond Finedured Format The medured format The Met The
1- Non Responsive -S 	i- Important 2- Very Improdunt		8Z Z9 Z9 LE E9 G01 E9	0 I V O O O O O O O O O	Z	Bid Bond Bid Bond Rippersel Form Rippersel Formation Date Date Met Thrancial Response Thrancial Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District	19 24 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 19 19	0 98 0 28 0 18 0 99 0 99 0 89 0 0 89 0	2 2 2 4 5 6 6	Besic 1879 Response d Bond d Bond no Proposal Form 15 Vear Term Offered Financial Response Transcial Response Transcial Response Welve Add Response Reaf Experience with District Meintenance/Service Biaff-Technical and Admin
1- Non Responsive -S 	i- Important 2- Very Improdunt		8Z Z9 Z9 LE E9 G01 C9	0 I V O O O O O O O O O	2	Bid Bond Appeal Form RFP in required formal Due Date Met Than Team Offered Than Team Offered Financial Response Technical Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Staff-Technical and Admin	19 24 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 19 19	0 98 0 12 0 15 0 99 0 99 0 0 89 0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 4 5 6 6	Basic 1879 Response d Bond drawing on Proposal Form FP in required formal to Date Mes Technical Response Technical Response Value Add Response Value Add Response Past Experience with District Basic Experience with District Past Experience with District Past Experience with District Basic Experience with District District of Maintenance Service Staff-Technical and Admin
6- Non Responsive -S 	i- Important 2- Very Improdunt		8Z Z9 Z9 LE E9 G01 E9	0 I V O O O O O O O O O	Z	Secom Basic REP Response Bid Bon Signature on Proposal Form Signature on Proposal Form Thrancial Response Technical Response	961 961 961 961 961 16	0 98 0 28 0 18 0 99 0 99 0 89 0 0 89 0	2 2 2 4 5 6 6	Deate 1879 Response d Bond d Bond d Bond d Bond formst as Date Met Term Offered Thrancial Response Term Calmical Response Term Staff Experience with District Methors and Response Methors of Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Administration of
6- Non Responsive -S 	i- Important 2- Very Improdunt		8Z Z9 Z9 LE E9 G01 E9	0 I V O O O O O O O O O	Z	Secom Basic REP Response Bid Bon Signature on Proposal Form Signature on Proposal Form Thrancial Response Technical Response	19 24 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 19 19	0 98 0 28 0 18 0 99 0 99 0 89 0 0 89 0	2 2 2 4 5 6 6	Deate 1879 Response d Bond d Bond d Bond d Bond formst as Date Met Term Offered Thrancial Response Term Calmical Response Term Staff Experience with District Methors and Response Methors of Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Methods and Response Administration of

Mark Gazette

Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	10	30
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met	<u> </u>		
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	10	30
Technical Response	3	10	30
Value Add Response	3	10	30
Past Experience with District	1	10	10
Maintenance/Service	2	10	20
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	10	20
Proximity to District	1	10	10
Total	il	†	200

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	7	21
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Financial Response	3	8	24
Technical Response	3	9	27
Value Add Response	3	1	3
Past Experience with District	1	10	10
Maintenance/Service	2	10	20
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	10	20
Proximity to District	1	10	10
Total			137

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	6	18
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	6	18
Technical Response	3	8	24
Value Add Response	3	5	15
Past Experience with District	1	10	10
Maintenance/Service	2	10	20
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	10	20
Proximity to District	1	10	10
Tota			155

Qwest_	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	8	24
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	6	18
Tashatasi Basasasa			30
Technical Response	3	10	30
Value Add Response	3		3
7.110	 	·	
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
	1		
Maintenance/Service	2	5	10
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	10	20
Proximity to District	1	10	10
			ļ
Total		1	136

Ronda Wheeler

Konda vynedier			
Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	10	30
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form		<u> </u>	
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	10	30
Technical Response	3	_10	30
Value Add Response	3	10	30
Past Experience with District	1		5
Maintenance/Service	-		10
Staff-Technical and Admin	1	2	10
Proximity to District		10	10
Tota	1		175

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	_1	3
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			L
RFP in required format			└ ───┤
Due Date Met	<u> </u>	 	
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Financial Response	3		15
Technical Response	3	5	15
Value Add Response	3	1	3
Past Experience with District	1		1
Maintenance/Service	2	10	20
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	10	20
Proximity to District	1	10	10
Tota	<u> </u>		89

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	1	3
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
	1		
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	1	3
	ļ		
Technical Response	3	10	30
Value Add Response	3	<u> </u>	3
B 4 E 4 A B	 	5	5
Past Experience with District	 	 	
Maintenance/Service	 		10
TO A STATE OF THE	† <u>-</u>	' 	T
Staff-Technical and Admin	1 2	10	20
		1	
Proximity to District	1		5
	T		
Total			99

Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	1	3
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	5	15
Technical Response	3	1	3
Value Add Response	3	1	3
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
Maintenance/Service	2	5	10
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	7	14
Proximity to District	1		5
Total	 		74

Tom Sanford

Minishtina	Daint Assessed	Total
3	10	30
L	<u> </u>	
2	9	18
3	10	30
3	10	30
		1
3	10	30
1	5	5
1		
2	9	18
† — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		1
2	g	18
1	<u> </u>	1
1	10	10
<u> </u>	† 	
		189
	3 3 3 3 1 1	2 9 3 10 3 10 1 5 2 9 2 9

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	1	3
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Financial Response	3	5	15
Technical Response	3	4	12
Value Add Response	3	3	9
Past Experience with District	1	5	5
Maintenance/Service	2	5	10
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	5	10
Proximity to District	1	•	
Total		<u> </u>	74

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	5	15
Bid Bond			I
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format	Ļ	Ļ	└
Due Date Met	ļ		1
15 Year Term Offered	2	9	18
Financial Response	3	1	3
Technical Response	3	4	12
Value Add Response	3	4	12
Past Experience with District	1	5	5
Maintenance/Service	2	5	10
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	8	16
Proximity to District	1	5	5
Tota			96

Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	1	3
Bid Bond			_
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
	<u> </u>		
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Flannist Bassana	3	2	6
Financial Response	- 3		
Technical Response	3	2	6
			
Value Add Response	3	1	3
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
	ļ	<u> </u>	
Maintenance/Service	2	2	
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
GENT CONTINUE END FORMAL	 		
Proximity to District	1	5	5
Total			34

Frank Klein

FIGUR KIEID			
Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	3	9
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met	<u> </u>		
	L		
15 Year Term Offered	2	2	4
	Ļ		
Financial Response	3	3	9
Technical Response	3	3	9
Technica Response			
Value Add Response	3	3	9
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
Proximity to District	1	1	
Treatmity to District	 	 '	
Total			50

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	1	3
Bid Bond			1
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Financial Response	3	1	3
Technical Response	3	3	9
Value Add Response	3	3	9
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total			36

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	2	8
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	2	4
	ļ		
Financial Response	3	2	8
Technical Response	3	3	9
		<u> </u>	
Value Add Response	3	3	9
Book Francisco suith District			
Past Experience with District		<u> </u>	
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
- III III III III III III III III III I			 -
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
	<u> </u>		
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total			44

Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	0	0
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Financial Response	3	1	3
Technical Response	3	1	3
Value Add Response	3	0	0
Past Experience with District	1	0	0
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total	 		17

Brenda Kraig

Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	10	30
Bid Bond	1		l
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	2	4
Financial Response	3	3	9
Technical Response	3	3	9
Value Add Response	3	3	9
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total			71

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	6	18
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			Ĺ
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	0	Ó
Financial Response	3	0	0
Technical Response	3	0	0
Value Add Response	3		0
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total			28

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	10	30
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form		1	
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	2	4
Financial Response	3	3	9
Technical Response	3	1	3
Value Add Response	3	1	3
Past Experience with District	1	1	1
Maintenance/Service	2	2	4
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	2	4
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total	<u> </u>		59

Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	6	18
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	2	4
Financial Response	3	1	3
Technical Response	3	0	0
Value Add Response	3	0	0
Past Experience with District	1	0	0
Maintenance/Service	2		0
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	0	0
Proximity to District	1	1	1
Total			26

Pete Montoya

rete Montoya			
Unite	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	10	30
Bid Bond		L	i
Signature on Proposal Form	L		1
RFP in required format		L	
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	10	30
T Alexander Response			
Technical Response	3	10	30
Value Add Response	3	10	30
Past Experience with District	1	9	8
Maintenance/Service	2	9	18
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	8	16
Proximity to District	1	9	8
Total			192

Comcast	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	9	27
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format		L	
Due Date Met		· · · ·	
15 Year Term Offered	2	1	2
Financial Response	3	4	12
			
Technical Response	3	-	24
	ļ <u>.</u>		ļ
Value Add Response	3		3
Past Experience with District			- 0
Fast Expenence with District	 	- "	<u>'</u>
Maintenance/Service	2		16
		 	,,,,,
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	8	16
Proximity to District	1	5	5
Total		<u> </u>	105

Secom	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	9	27
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
15 Year Term Offered	2	10	20
Financial Response	3	8	24
rinariciai Response			
Technical Response	3	9	27
		 	
Value Add Response	3	7	21
Part Part Part Part Part Part Part Part			
Past Experience with District	1	9	9
Maintenance/Service	2	7	14
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	9	18
The second secon	†		
Proximity to District	1	7	7
Total			167

· Qwest	Weighting	Point Award	Total
Basic RFP Response	3	3	9
Bid Bond			
Signature on Proposal Form			
RFP in required format			
Due Date Met			
	·		
15 Year Term Offered	2	9	18
·			
Financial Response	3	3	9
			
Technical Response	3	7	21
	 		
Value Add Response	3	0	0
Past Experience with District	<u> </u>		
Pask Experience with District	<u>'</u>	<u>'</u>	
Maintenance/Service	2	3	6
Staff-Technical and Admin	2	8	16
	<u> </u>		1
Proximity to District	1	5	5
Total			85

To Whom It May Concern

Ron Dunworth is the President and founder of ADVODA LLC, a 4 year old telecommunications company based in Greenwood Village, Colorado.

ADVODA LLC provides design and support services for clients nationwide, focusing on mid size commercial and industrial clients. ADVODA LLC also has developed a unique support group for education, K-12.

Dunworth originally designed and acted as project manager for the 1996 rework of Pueblo County School District 60 voice and data communications network. The network was comprised of leased high capacity services from Qwest communications as well as specialized switching equipment, which allowed the district to transmit voice and data service on the same services. The net result of the project was an increase in data communications, an implementation of high end voice services like remote call forwarding, four digit district wide dialing and district wide voice mail and a monthly cost savings of over 11 thousand dollars on its Qwest bill. Dunworth also helped the District file its first E-rate application and has supported the District as an E-rate consultant, with the exception of two years, since that time.

Because of its position as E-Rate consultant, ADVODA did not bid on the design of or the RFP development of the new District wide Leased data network or the hardware required to utilize it.

ADVODA works with several school districts in Colorado, supporting the design and deployment requirements and reviewing their RFP's and quotes in order to insure E-Rate compatibility and compliance.

Ron Dunworth ADVODA LLC